

COST COMPARISON

Hard Copy vs. Microfilm for the Storage and Maintenance of Inactive Records

1. Basis for Estimates

a. Estimates have been prepared on the existing hard copy storage plan as well as four different microfilm plans. Each microfilm plan has been compared separately with the hard copy plan. Estimates include all costs which can be directly identified or attributed to a specific plan.

STATINTL Since the new shelving [REDACTED] reportedly will be filled up in 6 years with inactive files, its associated costs were included in the hard copy plan.

b. The microfilm estimates attempt to show what costs are incurred when these same records are microfilmed as they become inactive and are stored for comparable amounts of time with the active files at Headquarters

[REDACTED] Each plan assumes a net growth of inactive files of 6,000 cubic feet per year (a stack 11 times as high as the Washington Monument) is to be dealt with. Each plan is costed for documents with a 6-year minimum retention and for 10-year minimum retention. Each plan uses a 6-year accumulation of 36,000 cubic feet of records for costing, since this is the approximate capacity of the shelves. The 10-year plan includes the costs for 4 additional years of storage and file maintenance for the same 36,000 cubic feet of records.

c. The microfilm plans include costs for maximum and minimum increases in personnel. Also, optional costs are provided for the production of Diazo duplicate rolls of microfilm to provide additional protection with storage of the silver original microfilm [REDACTED] and the use of STATINTL Diazo at Headquarters to service requests.

2. Explanation of Cost Items

a. Storage

(1) Equipment:

(a) Shelving cost and security installation costs are directly attributable to new hard copy storage and these costs will be repeated 6 years hence, at the present rate of growth.

(a) Safe storage cost at Headquarters was computed as follows:

Safe Cost	\$ 700.00
Ten-year amortization	70.00/year
Eight cubic feet of files per safe	8.75/cu. ft.
Floor space cost at Hqs., 1970	<u>5.00/cu. ft.</u>
TOTAL	\$ 13.75/cu. ft./year
Microminiaturization Factor, 1/100	\$.14/cu. ft.

(2) Building (Housing of records):

████████ Cost (per Records Management Officer), 1968 -

\$.32 per cubic foot year

Headquarters storage, 1970 (see safe storage costs above) -

\$5.00/cubic foot.

(3) Relocation: Self-explanatory.

b. File Preparation

(1) For Hard Copy Retirement - Approximately three safes or
████████ 24 cubic feet per day █████ - The equivalent of two
GS1 - 3's are estimated for this task.

(2) For Filming - Preparation of the file (6,000 cubic feet per
year) for filming is a task that would require 10 people according to
a 1968 estimate of the Records Management Office. It is felt, how-
ever, that most of this burden could be assumed by the █████ clerks STATINTL
now working with these files without an increase in the budget. The
costs for the minimum and maximum manpower have been estimated.

c. File Maintenance

(1) Request Inactive File - In comparing the two systems, a
basic tenet of this estimate is that the time required for a clerk at
Headquarters to prepare a request for records █████ and for all STATINTL
of the subsequent handling of the request and of the files at Headqua-
ters is at least equal to the time which would actually be required for

the same clerk to select a roll of microfilm from an office safe, put it on a reader, locate the proper document, and return the film to the file. The current total number of requests [REDACTED] has been estimated at 500 per day. No costs have been estimated for the two operations but it is believed that one cancels out the other in the cost comparison.

(2) Servicing of File - For hard copy [REDACTED] this cost was estimated by the Records Management Office at \$2 per cubic foot per year. It includes all cost [REDACTED] for filing, retrieving of file, guards, clerks, supervisors, etc. For servicing of inactive microfilm files at Headquarters, the cost has not been estimated but is considered to be equalized in the cost comparison as described above.

d. Filming. A 1968 paper by the Records Management Office estimated that 22 persons would be required to film the 6,000 cubic feet of records per year in order to achieve a "zero" net growth [REDACTED] The production and manpower estimates were as follows:

(1) Volume - 6,000 cubic feet per year, of which 8,000 cubic feet could be done on planetary cameras and 4,000 cubic feet on rotary cameras.

(2) Filming rate - Rotary camera, 3 cubic feet per day per operator per camera. Planetary camera, 1.5 cubic feet per day per operator per camera. This requires the equivalent of 12 man years of

camera operators per year with at least four rotary and eight planetary cameras in continuous operation producing an average of 24 rolls of film per day (24 cubic feet of documents per day) in order to produce the required 6,000 cubic feet per year (using 250 working days per year). An additional 10 man years annually would be required according to the 1968 Records Management Office paper for indexing, preparing the files for filming, feeding the documents to the camera operators, etc. As stated above, the writer feels that a substantial part of this work could be absorbed by the existing Agency clerical force that normally maintains these files prior to their retirement. For this reason, estimates are provided which are based on (a) a minimum increase of 2 clerical and 6 photographic personnel and (b) a maximum increase of 10 clerical and 12 photographic personnel.

e. Processing

This would include a technical inspection of each roll for density, resolution, blemishes, etc. At 50 feet per minute, the actual processing time could be as little as one or two hours per day for the 24 rolls.